Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 15 Sep 94   Volume 94 : Issue 447

Today's Topics:
                        Facts Speak volumes
                Status of "vanity" callsign proposal?

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Wed, 14 Sep 1994 05:14:11 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
Subject: Facts Speak volumes
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

suggs@tcville.es.hac.com writes:
>(Jeffrey Herman) writes:
>>(Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>>>But Jeff, your main arguement for continuing TESTING (the purpose of this
>>>discussion dispite your attempts to draw it AWAY from TESTING!) is a pool
>>>of trained radio operators. If there is not futher need for the pool
>>>(except in the "ham service") then we need no longer test for it.

>>The pool of trained operators provides for improving the technical
>>climate of our society.

>Huh??? How does Morse code testing improve the technical climate of our
>society?

By pool of trained operators I mean trained in building and

repairing radio equipment.

Now, I've already given my opinion how a new ham can start
his self-training.

Jeff NH6IL

Date: Tue, 13 Sep 1994 00:21:12 -0400 (EDT)
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!
news.intercon.com!news1.digex.net!usenet@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Status of "vanity" callsign proposal?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

On Sat, 10 Sep 1994, David R Tucker wrote:

> Doug Mauldin (gdmauldin@ualr.edu) wrote:
> :   Can someone confirm or deny the rumor I heard within the past few days
> : that the FCC has finally gone ahead with a plan to honor requests for
> : specific callsigns ("vanity" callsigns, in yuppie-speak)?
>
> Last I heard, after reviewing the comments they were going to try to
> implement a one-time $150 fee for a vanity call, which makes more
> sense anyway. Doing this requires Congressional action, since the
> only thing authorized now is $7/year. So we wait.

The $70 fee was published over a month ago in the new FCC fee schedule in
spite of the fact that the vanity amendment had not been adopted by the
Commission.

73 DE K4KYO

Date: Wed, 14 Sep 1994 05:24:43 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <russekCvz16v.A9o@netcom.com>, <CvzC59.A00@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<354bu5$iuu@tadpole.fc.hp.com>et
Subject : Re: Where can I get a FULL copy of FCC's Part 97??

In article <354bu5$iuu@tadpole.fc.hp.com> keith@fc.hp.com (John Keith) writes:
>Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:
>: Cory et al: You can get a copy of Part 97 within a few minutes via
>: email. Send an email to info@arrl.org and only write:
>: INDEX

```
>: QUIT
>: and a couple of minutes later you'll get the ARRL's list of files
>: available via email. Look for the three Part 97 files and order
>: them. Should only take another few minutes to receive them.

>Just a few comments:
>
>  1) I did the above process and got a very lengthy list of maybe some
>     potentially good material.

Well John, once you get licensed (I didn't see a callsign in your sig)
you'll find that more than `some' are `potentially' good!

>  2) A "couple of minutes" may be optimistic. I requested the index on Sunday
>     and it didn't show up until sometime on Monday. The request for the
>     Part 97 stuff was faster but still maybe ~ 30 minutes.

Interesting - from Newington to Hawaii in the evenings it only takes
a couple of minutes. You might be receiving the email files via
long path propagation.

>  3) Then the worst part, the copy of Part 97 is dated Dec 1, 1992!! Can't the
>     ARRL keep this dated material in better condition!

The ARRL probably received their copy in March or April of 1993; I
don't suspect there have been any major rule changes since then -
a nicely worded email to them would probably confirm this (but if
there have been any major changes I'm sure they would email you back
and let you know).

Check your library for the December 1993 copy of the CFR's - that
will be the most recent edition.

>John Keith
>keith@fc.hp.com

Jeff NH6IL

------------------------------

Date: Wed, 14 Sep 1994 05:36:50 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.3907.2427@channel1.com>,
<354ufu$fka$1@mhadg.production.compuserve.com>,
<091394214050Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>.Ha
Subject : Re: Facts Speak volumes
```

dan@amcomp.com (Dan Pickersgill) writes:

>There is nothing stopping
>the FCC from adopting any tests that they feel comply with the ITU. Or
>they could just notify the ITU that they are dropping out of that part of
>the requirements (as Japan has already done and Japan has 5 times as many
>hams as the US).

Dan, please tell us more about Japan's Experimenters License Class,
such as the limited amount of power output allowed, and about how only
domestic communications are allowed, and what restricted frequencies one
can operate on. You'll find that that class of `license' doesn't provide
much more than our CB radio service.

If the FCC made provisions for such a limited no-code HF license class
you'd be the first one on here screaming about it!

Jeff NH6IL

Date: 11 Sep 1994 21:04:43 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!nntp-server.caltech.edu!netline-
fddi.jpl.nasa.gov!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!sedona!
cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <34rjr9$hed@chnews.intel.com>, <34si1e$n8j@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<34vcdb$87d@news.iastate.edu>r
Subject : Re: Sum'tin for nut'in an

In article <34vcdb$87d@news.iastate.edu>,
William J Turner <wjturner@iastate.edu> wrote:
>
>This is a good statement! Notice he did not say anything to the effect
>that "morse code is a language understood by hams around the world."
>His "language" is not morse code, but the Phillips code and Q signals,
>etc, which is *much* closer to being a language than morse code is.
>Morse code still encodes this "language" but it isn't necessary for it.
>I like this statement **much** better than the statements of how "morse
>code allows communication around the world." This is much more accurate.

I agree 100%. The communication _mode_ could just as easily be SSB, FM,
TTY, or any of the other modes. It is _not_ CW, per se, that allows the
communication around the world. It is the coded letters which could be
sent in any mode... but primarily adopted by CW operators. On CW one says
..-. -... on SSB one says Fine Business and hams worldwide have been nice

to us Yanks and learned a certain amount of English.

After 41 years as a ham, I learned something from this thread, flames and all. I don't know the 'Q' signals very well nor the Phillips code. One reason is that the ARRL Operating Manual states under Phillips Code:

"Today this code is rarely used."

A few pages later it states:

"... make it a rule not to abbreviate unnecessarily when working an operator of unknown experience."

I have a new appreciation for abbreviations. If a ham outside the US doesn't know what the word "nickname" means I can spell out "SINE" phonetically and maybe he/she'll understand. Thanks a bunch, guys.

73, Cecil, KG7BK, OOTC (Not speaking for Intel)

--
 Intel, Corp.
 5000 W. Chandler Blvd.
 Chandler, AZ 85226

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #447
****